



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,667	02/10/2004	J. Kevin Alsobrook	8590-101	5868

36412 7590 02/10/2005

DUCKOR SPRADLING METZGER
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 2400
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-7915

EXAMINER

KUHNS, SARAH LOUISE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/777,667

Applicant(s)

ALSOBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

Sarah L Kuhns

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

It is the examiner's recollection that the election of claims 1-19 was made without traverse. Even so, applicant's argument that no new search is required for claims 20-24 is unpersuasive due to the different classification of these claims as stated in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-19 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is not adequate support in the specification for the addition of the language "abruptly jarring."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-7 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordes, U.S. Patent 3,636,999 in view of <http://www.cfic.ca>.

In regard to claims 1 and 25-27, Cordes discloses a method of processing vegetables, such as garlic and onions (column 2, line 27), having bulbs including root crowns comprising applying opposing forces to each one of the vegetables to separate the roots or portions thereof at or near the root crown from the remaining portion of the vegetable (column 1, line 64). Cordes teaches the use of gentle forces to pull out the roots of the vegetables rather than the use of abruptly jarring forces as claimed by applicant. However, it is not clear from applicant's specification as to what makes the opposing forces of applicant's method abruptly jarring or otherwise patentably distinct from the teaching of Cordes. Figure 3 of Cordes suggests that the bulbs are engaged by the rolls at an angle. Even so, altering this angle, so that the vegetable is in a vertical position as claimed by applicant, would not create any unexpected result and would further be an obvious way to optimize the efficiency of the derooter. Cordes does not expressly disclose the packaging of the vegetables in a container, but it is well established in the field to package vegetables before sale for consumer convenience as evidenced by the Canadian Food Information Council at <http://www.cfic.ca>. It would therefore be obvious to package the vegetables in order to have greater appeal to consumers in our fast paced society that are interested in time saving foods.

In regard to claim 2, Cordes discloses a method wherein the applying opposing forces includes applying force to the bottom portion of each one of the vegetables below the intersection of the root crown and the bulb in opposition to force applied to the top

Art Unit: 1761

portion of the vegetable to separate the bottom portion from the vegetable at the root crown (column 1, line 61).

In regard to claims 3 and 5, it would be expected and further obvious in Cordes that the separated portions of the vegetables are discarded since the entire point of the process is to remove the roots of the vegetable before sale and the roots are not eaten or otherwise useful.

In regard to claim 4, Cordes discloses a method wherein applying force to the bottom portion includes moving the bottom portion of the vegetables into engagement with at least one pair of rollers (column 1, line 31 and figure 3).

In regard to claim 6, Cordes discloses singulating a group of vegetables prior to the applying of force as demonstrated by figure 3.

In regard to claim 7, it is well known in the field to wash vegetables before sale. Therefore, it would have been obvious to wash the vegetables of Cordes in order to remove dirt and debris in order to increase the aesthetic appeal of the vegetables.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordes and <http://www.cfic.ca> as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Raaij, U.S. Patent 3,602,279. Cordes does not disclose peeling the foreskins from the vegetables. Raaij, however, teaches a method for skinning onions or like vegetables (column 1, line 34). Raaij further discloses that a machine for peeling the foreskins from vegetables can be synchronized with an apparatus for removing the root portions of the vegetables (column 1, line 44). It would therefore be obvious to peel the foreskins from the

Art Unit: 1761

derooted vegetables in order to remove unnecessary material from the vegetable so as to increase the aesthetic appeal of the vegetables.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordes and <http://www.cfic.ca>, further in view of Raaij, U.S. Patent 3,602,279, as applied to claim 8 above, in view of Losito, U.S. Patent 3,734,004.

In regard to claim 9, Cordes does not disclose supporting the vegetable vertically by its stalk. However, Losito teaches supporting the vegetable vertically by its stalk (figure 4) while its roots are severed. It would therefore be obvious to support the vegetable by its stalk while its roots are pulled out in order to prevent injuries or bruising during removal of the roots as clearly taught by Losito.

In regard to claim 10, Cordes further discloses translating the vegetables along a path of travel (column 5, line 23).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordes and <http://www.cfic.ca>, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Kruithoff, U.S. Patent 4,753,296.

In regard to claim 11, Cordes discloses translating the vegetables along a path of travel into engagement with a de-rooter (column 5, line 23) to apply force to the bottom portion of the vegetable (column 1, line 61), but fails to disclose translating the vegetables substantially vertically. However, Kruithoff teaches translating the vegetables substantially vertically along a path of travel into engagement with a de-rooter (figure 4). It would therefore be obvious to translate the vegetables substantially

Art Unit: 1761

vertically rather than horizontally if circumstances, such as those during harvesting, made it preferable to do so.

In regard to claim 12, Cordes further discloses translating the vegetables to a second de-rooter to repeat the applying force to the bottom portion of the vegetables (column 1, line 31).

Claims 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordes and <http://www.cfic.ca>, in further view of Kruithoff, as applied to claim 11 above, in further view of Losito.

In regard to claim 13, Cordes fails to disclose an opposing force caused by the holding the upper portion of the vegetables. However, Losito teaches the holding of the upper portion of a vegetable while the roots are removed (figure 4). It would therefore be obvious to hold the upper portion of the vegetable when removing the roots by pulling rather than by severing in order to provide support for the vegetable and increase the opposing force for more efficient pulling of the roots.

In regard to claim 14, it is well known in the field to wash vegetables before sale. Therefore, it would have been obvious to wash the vegetables of Cordes in order to remove dirt and debris in order to increase the aesthetic appeal of the vegetables.

In regard to claim 15, it is well known in the field to group vegetables before sale in order to provide a unit for sale comprising a number of the vegetables.

In regard to claim 16, Cordes discloses a de-rooter that includes a pair of members rotating in opposite directions (figure 3).

In regard to claims 17 and 18, Cordes discloses a pair of rotating members comprising a pinch roller and a meshing gear (figure 3). It would be an obvious alternative to use either a pair of pinch rollers or a pair of meshing gears to accomplish the same task of removing the crown and/or roots from the vegetable without bruising the vegetable.

In regard to claim 19, Cordes fails to disclose a moveable clamp. Losito teaches that a vegetable can be clamped between foam pieces that are attached to parallel belts when de-rooting (figure 4). Losito also teaches that the clamp is moveable because when the vegetable reaches the end of the belt, the opposing foam pieces separate to release the vegetable (figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use clamps in Cordes in order to prevent injuries or bruising during removal of the crown and/or roots.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 6th, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant also argues that the Cordes device is primarily adapted for garlic bulbs. However, Cordes states that his invention will work efficiently on onion bulbs in certain instances (column 2, lines 27-30). Additionally, applicant does not claim a process relating to onions specifically, only to vegetables and garlic falls within this category.

Applicant argues that the invention of Cordes does not work with fresh onions. This argument is unpersuasive because applicant claims vegetables, which is a broad

Art Unit: 1761

category, including not only onions but also garlic, and does not claim the condition of the vegetables.

Applicant also argues that the invention of Cordes does not allow for the top of the onion without the root to be saved. However, applicants' claims do not require that the top of the vegetable be left untouched. The claims do not particularly limit the process to removal of the roots while saving the top.

Applicant argues that the gentle pulling action of Cordes will not yield the "unexpected result of separating the roots or portions thereof," also alleging that it prevents or eliminates unwanted "telescoping" growth of the vegetable. In response to applicant's argument, it is submitted that such unexpected results are not available to the examiner. Applicant is invited to submit unexpected results, showing that the gentle pulling of Cordes would not produce such unexpected results. Lacking of such unexpected results, it is the examiner's position that no patentable distinction exists.

Applicant further argue that the device of Cordes is incapable of "applying abruptly jarring opposing forces acting substantially in line between the top and bottom portions of each one of the vegetables." Figure 3 of Cordes suggests that the bulbs are engaged by the rolls at an angle. Even so, altering this angle, so that the vegetable is in a vertical position as claimed by applicant, would not create any unexpected result and would further be an obvious way to optimize the efficiency of the derooter.

Applicant states that the CFIC reference does not teach the applying of "abruptly jarring opposing forces" to a vegetable. This is not necessary since Cordes teaches this step. The examiner relies on the CFIC reference solely for the teaching of packaging

vegetables. The motivation to package the vegetables of Cordes according to the teaching of the CFIC reference is to have greater appeal to consumers in our fast paced society that are interested in time saving foods, as stated both above and in the previous office action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah L. Kuhns whose telephone number is 571-272-1088. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.


Application/Control Number: 10/777,667
Art Unit: 1761

Page 10

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLK


MILTON I. CANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700